UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

The Truth About Spain

By DEVERE ALLEN

VOLUME CVII NUMBER 15

Chicago, June 8, 1931

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly *Subscription $3.00*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
CHARLES E. BEALS
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
WALTER WALSH
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
ITALY—DOROTHY WALTON
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 227
Litvinoff—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 229
Jottings—J. H. H. 231

ARTICLES—

Speaking of Prohibition—*Governor Winthrop* 227
The Truth About Spain—DEVERE ALLEN 231
What's Right With the World (The Ayes Have It)—DOMBEY SHEPHERD 234
Thoughts of Tolstoy—Part XXX 235
Women and War—ANNA NUSSBAUM 237

POETRY—

Caged Eagle—EDITH MIRICK 236

THE STUDY TABLE—

A Program of Social Reform—JAMES A. FAIRLEY 238

THE FIELD—

Against Compulsory Military Training 226
The Loin Cloth—*M. K. Gandhi—Young India* 240
Military Insurance 240

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Against Compulsory Military Training

Students of the University of California at Los Angeles are petitioning the Regents to have military training made optional instead of compulsory at that school. At the present time these petitions are being circulated on the campus so that all students who favor this stand may sign. As yet no estimate can possibly be made of the number of signatures, but it is expected that the list will run up into a considerable proportion of the student body.

Prominent students, with the exception of those who are definitely linked up with the R. O. T. C. in the capacity of student officers, are quite favorable in their response. Some of the prominent students who have signed are: Dean McHenry, Student Body President-elect; John Talbot, Junior Class President; Edward Hathcock, Chairman of the Welfare Board; Charles Olton, Editor of the Daily Bruin; Max Clark, Managing Editor of the Daily Bruin; Carl Schaeffer, former editor; every member of the debating squad; and many others.

The greatest opposition to the movement has come from the Better America Federation, the American Legion, and other self-styled protectors of our country's welfare. Also the downtown press has, with but few exceptions, been opposed to our stand. In several instances articles and editorials of a libelous nature were printed, matter that was absolutely without fact, and which constituted a positively slanderous attack against the University and members of the student body. Besides printing deliberate lies, the newspapers have consistently distorted news in an effort to discredit the movement by giving it an appearance of agitation and revolt. In actuality, all we are doing is circulating a petition for presentation to the Board of Regents, no more, no less. Any other reports are grossly exaggerated.

Up until the present time, this has been a student movement only. Now we are asking citizens who favor our stand to write letters to us stating their position. They may address these to Edward Walther, University of California at Los Angeles.

Reports have been circulated that the Regents definitely have no authority to act upon this matter. Dr. Sproul, President of the University, has taken that stand, stating that it is his opinion, after reading the law on the subject, that compulsory military training is required by legislative statute. However, Dr. Haines, Professor of Political Science and Constitutional Law at U. C. L. A., states that the legislature has definitely given the power of controlling the matter over to the Board of Regents. Obviously, it is still an open question and

(*Continued on Page* 239)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

VOLUME CVII MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1931 NUMBER 15

SPEAKING OF PROHIBITION!

"Liberty is of two kinds: Personal liberty and civic liberty. Personal liberty is of the kind practiced by the man who claims a right to follow his own inclination and gratify his own desires, regardless of the rights of his neighbors in the community. This kind of liberty debases a man, is evil and causes strife.

"Civic liberty is of the kind practiced by the man who thinks and acts as he chooses after first considering the rights of others in the community. This kind of liberty is good. It increases the character of the man. It makes for civilization."

—Governor Winthrop.

UNITY mourns its beloved friend and editorial correspondent, Dr. Walter Walsh, dead in London on May 20th last. Dr. Walsh was as thoroughgoing a radical as we ever knew. Born in Dundee, Scotland, in 1857, he fought his way through the tangled jungle of theological orthodoxy, and as founder and leader of the Free Religious Movement in London became one of the outstanding religious liberals of his time. In politics he was an early member of the Independent Labor Party, and in these later years was active as a "left-wing" opponent of the MacDonald leadership. His greatest testing-time came in the War when, an ardent pacifist, he found himself one of that little group of heroic Britishers who refused to bow the knee to Mars. An ardent comrade of the late E. D. Morel, Dr. Walsh was denounced, vilified, mobbed, but never altered his position or compromised his conviction. With British imperialism, of course, he had not the slightest sympathy. In recent years he was a passionate advocate of Gandhi's cause, and on the eve of the recent Round Table Conference attracted wide attention by an open letter to the Prime Minister on behalf of a free India. In appearance, Dr. Walsh was of the rugged prophetic type. His speech, beautifully colored by his wide acquaintanceship with literature, was invariably "Yea, yea," and "Nay, nay." There was no weakness in this man, no concession to anything which to him was wicked. But, like all such heroic men, he was infinitely tender, the soul of grace and courtesy, and in much of his thought and practise a true mystic. Dr. Walsh's contributions to UNITY were frequent, and always among the most valuable material in our columns. Freedom, brotherhood, peace—these were his watchwords. He lived, as he died, a forerunner of the better day to come.

We read, or tried to read, the reports covering the recent meeting of the Council of the League of Nations at Geneva, but they were too much for us. If anybody could make head or tail out of it all, or find any encouragement in the state of Europe, we should like to see this person and get the advantage of his light and leading. Our one impression, we must confess, was that of a group of witless men, blindly groping in a dense fog, and resolutely whistling and shouting to one another to keep up courage. Of honest statesmanship, clear vision, and intellectual grasp of realities we could find not a vestige, except perhaps in the case of Litvinoff, the Russian delegate who, on the trade issue, presented something that had at least the superficial lineaments of a program. But of course, things being what they are, this Bolshevik proposal only added to the confusion, for the idea that the European nations should agree on anything, or cooperate together for any purpose, simply frightens the foreign secretaries out of their seven senses. The welcome given to Litvinoff's idea reminded us inevitably of the similar welcome given some years ago to the Soviet proposal for immediate and simultaneous disarmament. Of course, the Russians are not taken seriously. But why not call their bluff, if it is a bluff, and thus end their chicanery? And when is any nation going to be taken seriously in making any proposal that goes straight to the heart of existing problems? Our own feeling at the moment is that conditions in Europe are about as bad as they can be short of open war itself. Perhaps the mere fact that there is a league and that under its benign auspices the nations find it still possible to get together, is a reason for hope. But the hope seems like a faint and feeble ray amid much darkness.

When the President of the Pennsylvania Railroad comes out against the tariff, something new has happened in American history. When a member of the United States Inter-State Commerce Commission announces his conversion to the principle of government ownership, a new epoch in the life of modern times has been begun. Both of these amazing events have taken place in recent weeks, and we should not be surprised to see other events of the same kind come in rapid succession. Two explanations of these phenomena may

be offered. In the first place, our business and political leaders are beginning to awaken to the fact that the present industrial depression is no casual accident. It is a breakdown of our entire system of production and distribution, requiring drastic changes in our social system if our capitalistic civilization is to survive. In the second place, and more important, there is at work here that general principle, justified again and again in history, that the radicals of any age are right and need only the passing of time to have their policies adopted by the powers-that-be. For years the despised minority have been declaring that the tariff was fatal to prosperity as well as hateful to goodwill and peace. A pioneer country like America, with enormous territory and wealth, was able for long to overcome the handicap which the tariff imposed upon her. But now these adolescent days are over, and in maturity the nation discovers that her tariff is strangling her to death. Free trade, always right in theory, is now being proved sound in practise. So also with government ownership of natural resources, public utilities, and great interstate business! The Socialists happen to be correct in their idea that no highly developed economic society can live on the basis of competition—that cooperation through the directive agency of government is absolutely essential to survival. And now, reluctantly but inevitably, the conservatives are finding this out. "The arc of the universe is long," said Theodore Parker, "but it bends toward justice."

The New York *World-Telegram* thinks it sees in recent decisions of the Supreme Court a new court. The *Nation* confirms this view. Long reactionary, this Washington tribunal seems suddenly to have become liberal. The famous dissenters, Holmes and Brandeis, occasionally joined by Stone, now have as their allies the new chief-justice, Mr. Hughes, and the youngest member of the bench, Mr. Roberts. This makes five—and five constitutes a majority of the Court. In substantiation of its argument, the *World-Telegram* gives a list of "some of the new majority's decisions" as handed down on a single day (Monday, May 18th last):

> In the Yetta Stromberg case it once more exposed California "justice" and threw out that State's red flag law as unconstitutional. There the question was constitutional human rights.
>
> It other cases it refused to be blinded by property rights. It upheld the constitutionality of the Indiana law imposing a graduated tax on chain stores—without, of course, passing on the virtue or evil of the law, which was none of its business.
>
> It upheld the validity of the Boulder Dam act. It upheld, the Ohio excise tax on public utilities. It upheld an order of the California Railroad Commission against three Western roads refusing to use a union station in Los Angeles.
>
> It declined to review a public utility case against the city of Indianapolis. It threw out an invalid patent on the carbon dioxide method of refrigerating foodstuffs.
>
> Finally, the Court upheld the right of the government to refuse oil and gas prospecting permits in the interest of conservation.

Of these decisions the one in the Stromberg case is by all odds the most important. This case will be remembered as the one which involved arrests at a private camp of Communists over which waved a red flag much as a crimson flag might wave over a Harvard camp. Heavy sentences imposed for this offense of the red flag are now happily declared by the Supreme Court to be unconstitutional. Others of these decisions, however, are important. All of them together make an impressive exhibit for the contention of the *World-Telegram* and the *Nation* that we have a new court today in Washington. Although opposed to Chief Justice Hughes on many issues, and not at the time favorable to his appointment to the Supreme bench, we are entirely sincere in our wish that, for his own sake, as well as for the sake of the cause in general, this able man and brilliant lawyer may make a record in his term of office which may be as conspicuous for its liberalism as the Taft regime was conspicuous for its conservatism. Mr. Hughes has it in him, if he will, to be another Marshall.

We wrote the above editorial paragraph on a Thursday. On the following Tuesday (May 26th) there appeared in the New York *Herald-Tribune* a long despatch from its distinguished correspondent, Mr. Mark Sullivan, declaring that recent decisions of the Supreme Court indicated a swing from conservative to liberal sentiment which constituted something like an historical event. Then on this same day, as though to prove that in politics as in nature there is no counting on the weather, there came the sensational and depressing decision in the Macintosh and Bland cases involving the question of citizenship in relation to conscientious objections against war. In this decision there was the customary 5 to 4 vote, but, instead of being on the liberal side of the question, the newest justice on the bench, Mr. Roberts, of Pennsylvania, was this time on the conservative side, and thus swung the Court back into its ways of darkness. This shakes our confidence in the judgment, so widely affirmed in these recent days, that the Supreme Court is no longer a reactionary body. For if ever there was a decisive test, it was on this issue as to whether the government has absolute power not only over the lives but also over the consciences of its citizens. Every militarist, every one hundred per center, every patrioteer and black persecutor in the land will rejoice in this decision, and every free mind will mourn. The only heartening aspect of the situation, apart from the unshaken fidelity of Holmes, Brandeis and Stone, is the attitude of the Chief Justice who handed down the opinion of the dissenting minority. Mr. Hughes spoke not only with intellectual clarity but with passionate conviction when he in effect denounced the declaration of the Court that men and women of high character must be outlawed from the nation's life if they are civilized enough to be

opposed to war. It seems to be certain now that the Chief Justice is prepared to lead the enlightened sentiment of the nation.

Protests against the recent aerial manoeuvers of the War Department were few and far between. The churches on the whole were silent, except only in New Haven and Hartford, Connecticut, where the clergy with one voice sent demands to the President that the war game be called off. But in this case there was a peculiar reason involved—namely, the desecration of the Sabbath in having the flying machines roaring in the skies on a scheduled Sunday when the people were (supposed to be!) at worship. We agree that it is an outrage, perhaps a special outrage, that the peace and order of a city should be wantonly disturbed on Sunday. But if this monstrous war display was a desecration of this day, we cannot see why it was not an equal desecration of every day as well. These New Haven and Hartford clergymen acted well, but we could wish that they had based their protests on firmer and more inclusive grounds. We always feel unhappy when ministers take a stand against any public evil because of interference with their churches, or their services, or their Sundays. Let them abandon special privileges and professional considerations, and judge things good or evil from the simple standpoint of human interest. In the case of these aerial war games, perpetrated under the authority of the only Quaker president this country has ever had, there was reason enough for protest apart from all ecclesiastical concerns whatsoever. Here was a deliberate attempt to debauch the public mind, to stir up international fears and hatreds, to reestablish the old fiction of war's excitement and glory, to further the movement for armed preparedness. Sunday or no Sunday, the churches of this nation should have spoken with a single and insistent voice against this betrayal of the cause of peace.

Litvinoff

I saw Litvinoff in August, 1922. I was coming out of Moscow to Riga on one of the two trains which ran each week. On this train, with its broken-down equipment and endless line of cars which were only cattle cars but which at that time were crowded with miserable swarms of human beings, there was one car known as "the courier's car," on which traveled officers and guests of the Soviet government. I had been in Moscow for something over a fortnight. My period of stay had ended, and I was returning to what at home we called "civilization." In this car was Litvinoff, traveling to Berlin to relieve Chicherin, Commissar of Foreign Affairs, who was at that time carrying on important negotiations on behalf of his government with Germany. I had seen Chicherin at the Soviet Embassy on the Unter den Linden—a small, shrunken, stooped figure, old before his time, worn by long suffering and privation, and yet carrying on single-handed against the hostile governments of the world and winning that long series of diplomatic victories which marked him as incomparably the greatest foreign statesman of his time.

Litvinoff, as I saw him on the train, was a different type of man—short of figure, erect in stature, rather stout, with a lifted head and short-sighted eyes peering through strong glasses. I tried hard to meet him during the slow and boresome journey to the Latvian border. I wanted to talk with him and learn some secrets if I could about Soviet policy. But he was too busy. Again and again I passed the open door of his stateroom but always he was poring over vast piles of paper or conferring with earnest and absorbed companions. I had not the heart, or perhaps lacked the courage, to intrude. I never in my life have had any impudence of this kind and thus have failed many a time to force my way into the presence of great men. I did succeed, through the kindly interest of the courier, in securing Litvinoff's autograph, which is now a prized item in my autograph collection. On one station platform, while we were waiting through the interminable hours which seemed to pass every time the train came to a stop, I joined a group which gathered round Litvinoff, and was casually introduced, and listened to a helter-skelter conversation about nothing in particular between jovial comrades. This was the nearest that I came to the man who was even at that early time one of the half-dozen greatest and most influential leaders of the Soviet Republic. But this was enough to show me the importance of Litvinoff in the eyes of his own associates, and the essential power of the man in his conduct of large public affairs. Since that day, a decade ago, Litvinoff has gained steadily in position and in fame. He is today the Foreign Secretary of Russia, and by all odds the most experienced, astute, and courageous statesman on the continent. His recent appearance at Geneva, where he crossed swords with the best brains of England, France, Italy, Germany and lesser governments, showed him to be a match for all, and without question the only outstanding and creative political leader of the time.

To one like myself who has little respect for the statesmen in our western nations, and no concern at all for what happens or does not happen to any one of them, it was an occasion of exhilarating delight to see the way in which Litvinoff stood up before the representatives of the nations at Geneva and, by the sheer

courage and candor of his utterances, revealed their sham and hypocrisy stark naked to the world. It reminded me of an earlier performance of Litvinoff some years ago at one of the preliminary disarmament meetings which proved to be so ridiculous a farce.

Our western governments, so devoted to peace, had come together, it will be remembered, to consider the great problem of disarmament. The men at this disarmament conference had talked endlessly about the tonnage of ships, the calibre of guns, the displacement of hulls, the size of armies, the budget expenditures for preparedness, and so on without end, but apparently were making little progress. Suddenly, without warning of any kind, Litvinoff arose before them, and, to their utter amazement and horror, said very simply that he understood that the nations present had assembled in the interest of disarmament, that in the service of such an interest the logical thing to do was to disarm, disarm completely, immediately, simultaneously, and that Russia, which he had the honor to represent, would itself disarm if the other nations present would undertake to do the same. This speech, for reasons which I have never been able to understand, was regarded as a joke, or worse yet, as a deliberate attempt to catch the capitalistic powers napping and then to destroy them. To my own feeble way of thinking, the speech was obviously an attempt to carry out the purposes for which the preliminary disarmament conference had been summoned. But I recall that it is the rule of diplomacy to assume that any speech, or letter, or document means not what it says at all but precisely the opposite of what it says. It was therefore inevitable, perhaps, that Litvinoff's speech should be received in this cynical and scoffing way.

Now Litvinoff has been at Geneva again in these recent weeks gone by, and again he has stood up and made a speech. This time the question was not so much disarmament as economics. After endless hemming and hawing, beating about the bush, evading real issues and inventing false ones on the part of various representatives of the western powers, Litvinoff once more stood upon his feet and ventured to do the unprecedented thing of telling some blunt truths. He pointed out, exactly as President Hoover had done some days before, that until the nations had disarmed and thus gotten rid of the intolerable tax burdens imposed by the unprecedented costs of armies and navies, there could be no relief from industrial depression and social misery. He denounced high tariffs, and pointed out the elementary proposition that tariffs interfered with trade, stopped buying on one side of the frontier and selling on the other. He emphasized with irrefutable logic the disastrous part that the reparations and war debts were playing in the present tragic situation, and urged their cancellation. He even had the audacity to talk about "dumping," and the effrontery to point out that Russia was not the only country that was engaged in this desperate performance. Not satisfied with analyzing the situation, Litvinoff went on, like a skillful physician, to suggest remedies. If armaments are burdensome, he argued sensibly that they should be abolished, and that Russia was ready to take steps whenever the other nations were. If tariffs are ruinous, they should be lowered or gotten rid of altogether, and Russia was prepared any day to sign general trade agreements with other nations whenever mutual guarantees against discrimination in foreign markets could be properly arranged. If "dumping" is ruinous to everybody concerned, as it obviously is, then dumping should be stopped, and Litvinoff offered right there and then at the council table in Geneva to sign an international convention prohibiting "dumping." Of course his listeners were dumbfounded, and of course also they did nothing. The Russian Commissar had called the bluff of these representatives of the capitalistic powers, and immediately their hands were shown to be empty. Meanwhile, far away in the rear, Litvinoff was duly ridiculed and denounced. One New York newspaper called him a clown, and another described his speech as an insult. But Briand and one or two other realists at Geneva were honest enough to recognize that Litvinoff had spoken the only truth that had been heard at the conference, but none knew better than these men themselves that just because it was the truth, it was hated and feared, and of course could not under any circumstances be acted upon.

Soviet Russia has a bad reputation in diplomacy. This reputation is founded exclusively upon the fact that the Bolsheviki will have nothing to do with shams, have given up dealing in "bunk," and insist, with a certain sublime honesty, in penetrating straight to the heart of every problem and seeking the scientific remedy. Above all, Russia is detested and distrusted because she never hesitates to apply the test of reality to the arrant hypocrisy of our western life, and thus reveal its shame. In this fine art of exposé, Litvinoff is of all men living the greatest master. Impervious to ridicule, indifferent to insult, with a mind as exact as an adding machine, with a vision as clear as a light ray, with a courage as indomitable as his courtesy is impeccable, Litvinoff brings into European diplomatic life the one element of perfect integrity that it contains. I wish that this man might be a delegate to every international congress. I wish that he might visit every Western capital and speak facts as only he can speak them. I wish, above all things, that he might, by some gift of Communist magic, cast into a sudden sleep the dull and dishonest statesmen with whom he has to deal, and thus himself be left to take charge for a little time of our distracted and chaotic international life. I venture to suggest that he would do things, and that when

these things were done, this world would be a better place in which to live.

I like to think of Litvinoff as I saw him on that train coming out of Russia. With what persistency he worked, with what swift clarity he talked, with what energy he drove a train which I think perhaps might never have arrived at its destination had he not been aboard. Some day historians will recognize that the men who have guided the affairs of Russia since November, 1917, constitute the greatest group of statesmen that the world has seen since that wonderful group which drew up the Constitution of the United States in 1787 and carried on the life of our American Republic in the first decades of its existence. And among the few greatest of these great men will be remembered always Litvinoff, Commissar of Foreign Affairs.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Jottings

In the recent air manoeuvers, the aerial defense of Chicago was postponed a day because of rain. Just like war! For of course if Chicago were attacked in war time, the enemy would certainly hold off its attack if it rained a little.

The Toscanini episode in Italy revives memories of the Karl Muck episode here in America during the War. In both cases, great orchestral leaders refused, for obvious artistic reasons, to play national anthems at their concerts. And they were promptly punished. What a confounded nuisance patriotism is!

Sir James Jeans declares that the universe is destroying itself in ceaseless battling between atoms and electrons. Gen. Ludendorff asserts that the "next war" will break out in Europe not later than July. Between the wars of the nations and the wars of the atoms, what chance has poor humanity?

We have always wondered why race-horses are named as they are. We are still wondering as we discover a race-horse named "Gandhi."

If the proposed customs union between Austria and Germany is in violation of the covenant of the League of Nations, what are we to think of the Covenant of the League of Nations?

Will Rogers is the bravest as well as the wittiest of men. He has declined a college degree!

J. H. H.

The Truth About Spain

A week before the recent revolution, I entered Spain. I went for the first time, a sympathetic visitor, but with many false notions in my head. Even as it was, I fancy that, from reading in sources the average person does not follow, I was far above the usual in optimism concerning the future of the country; but I was hardly prepared for everything that followed. I have had good fortune before; but nothing in my life ever gave me such a thrill as the transition from Monarchy to Republic. Never had I hoped to witness so colorful and so magnificent a demonstration of democratic competence.

Spain has not only often failed to put its best foot forward; it has been sadly distorted by untrue reports. It is true that the Spanish character, if any generalizations are ever correct, is highly individualistic; it is a fact that Spain's history has been filled with bloodshed, violent revolt, and continuous upheaval; it is beyond all doubt that divisionism of many kinds, with an infinite crisscrossing of purposes, has cursed the land for many generations. But the frequent picture of a people brutalized by bullfights and the prey of demagogues, bursting out in conflict over the merest trifles, and incapable of sound self-rule, has had no basis in fact.

If we are to understand the new republic, we must shake ourselves free both from prejudice and propaganda. And of propaganda there has been quite enough to account for much of the prejudice. American newspapers have had few correspondents in Spain, and these, as a rule, have received their tips from the monarchy and the aristocracy with whom our commercial representatives have always hobnobbed. The British press and the French press, from whom we have derived a large amount, indirectly, of our information, have been utterly unreliable as a rule: the former has been biased because Alfonso married into the British royal family, and the latter because of a general nationalistic superciliousness if not, on occasion, downright venality. Thus, even after the departure of Alfonso, one of the leading French papers called the revolution a disaster, and most of the rest raised hands in holy horror and predicted the speedy triumph of bolshevism across the Pyrenees. Unbending, a large section of the British press is still stirring up trouble by false reports of Spanish Republican excesses that never happened. I wish I had space here for detailed samples of this propaganda; but I assert without hesitation that I have at hand, as I write, sufficient evidence to blacken the repute of many papers which already, to those who know them, are unsavory enough.

One of the greatest legends about Spain was that of the superior competence of Alfonso as a leader. He it was, so we were told, who brought the essential sta-

bility to the country, and without whose guidance it would descend into an abyss of insecurity. Those who fed on this myth seldom investigated far enough to see one important truth: namely, that during his entire reign of almost twenty-nine years, Alfonso changed his Ministries some thirty-three different times. Was this stability? They also fail to see that it was Alfonso who, by deliberately violating the constitution, a practice he began at his first Cabinet meeting when made ruler at the age of sixteen, he opened up every conceivable excuse for unconstitutional procedure on the part of army careerists and the apostles of violent revolution. They also do not realize that, if Alfonso did not actually connive at the offensive dictatorship which lasted from 1923 to 1930, he was glad to see it come, in order to save himself from a pending parliamentary report on the illegal manner in which he had interfered with the anti-Riff war, bringing disaster, and undertaking piratical raids which can in no wise be justified on any grounds. And if there is, superficially, some reason to agree with the ex-King about the ineptitude of the old *Cortes,* or parliament, a thoughtful observer will hardly pass over the constant intrigues and manipulation by which Alfonso for many years had sought to nullify its power.

Quite fallaciously, the impression has often been conveyed abroad that the anti-monarchist forces in Spain were anarchist in a violent sense, that they were led by roustabouts and militaristic adventurers. Nobody ought to deny that in Barcelona, and in less degree at Madrid, the advocates of assassination had manifested their repulsive methods; but what has not been made sufficiently clear is that, at any rate within the last twenty years, these futile firebrands were no more representative of labor revolt than the few assassins who have besprinkled American history with the blood of presidents.

One of the first questions faced by Alfonso when he became King in 1902 was that of the military schools. These had been gradually allowed to fade out as national powers; but the young King, himself trained in one and thoroughly indoctrinated with that militaristic ardor he has exhibited throughout his rule, insisted that these schools be opened up and extended. From then onward, officers poured out annually into the Spanish nation, until, when the events of last April took place, Spain, a country in practically no need of an army even by military standards so far as foreign enemies are concerned, had almost two hundred and fifty generals and over twenty thousand officers—one officer for every ten privates! It is highly significant that one of the first moves of the new régime was to offer life pensions to every army officer, if he would retire; the army schools will be shut down, in large number, as soon as present students graduate; all sorts of appropriations for military training will be heavily cut, and a smaller, non-political army will be retained more in the nature of a police force than anything else. This, for Spain, is revolution with a vengeance. It is further significant that the revolution, which in fact was planned last December and almost launched at that time, only being prevented by the inadequate organization which caused it to "go off" prematurely, was led in all of its policies by non-military men. The first revolutionary manifesto ever issued in Spain entirely by civilians was that of last December; and today not a single man of the Cabinet is a military leader. This too, is drastic change indeed.

For years the mainstays of the monarchy were the army and the Church. I mean to make no sweeping generalizations about the Catholic religion whatsoever, and I have in mind only the particular Spanish situation when I say that the most reactionary, and often the most corrupt, element in Spanish politics was the Roman Catholic clericalism which held Alfonso under its thumb, which grabbed for special privilege and got it, which stifled all other religions, and which fought to the last gasp for the preservation of royalism and the aristocracy. On the very eve of the elections, the Primate himself issued a statement condemning the republican groups as "dishonest" people, unworthy of support by Catholics. Nevertheless, what is hopeful and productive of a higher regard for the rank and file, is the indisputable fact that almost everywhere, even in the most sacred precincts of the Church, priests and monks disregarded the warnings of their overlords, and voted against the royalty. The rapid transition from an institution with its hands in the King's and its fingers in the treasure chests, to a Church on equal footing with all others, dissociated from political power, sounds like an impossible miracle to anyone who has studied Spanish affairs at all; and yet, knowing that their very own people would no longer condone their activities, the Church leaders are bowing gracefully to the inevitable.

How the anti-monarchists astutely faced this difficult Church question was interestingly shown by the pre-election campaigning. At Albacete, where not more than five hundred people had ever come out to a meeting of the anti-monarchists, early in April twelve thousand appeared to listen to two campaign speakers, and an equal number of would-be listeners failed to get inside the huge arena. Both of these speakers are now in the Provisional Government, and one of them told me that the response of Churchmen was marvellously encouraging. The first of the two speakers frankly announced himself a radical Protestant, and said that he doubtless appeared as an agnostic to his hearers; he reverenced the Catholic religion, he said, but opposed its official partisanship in politics as a bulwark to the monarchy. He was followed by the second speaker, a man recognized throughout all Spain as a great Catholic layman, who now added his personal agreement to what the first speaker had said. It was significant that these men were cheered to the echo; and it bodes well for the success of the new Government that it contains a mixture of devout Catholics, Agnostics, and Protestants of varying views. Definitely, the hold of established religion on the people, for the benefit of the few and the perpetuation of despotic political control by a wealthy clique, has been forever broken. A new and finer religious life, in all its various manifestations, may now arise.

The tempestuous nature of the Spanish masses, another legend of the past, has been exploded by the revolution. I was lucky enough to be at the very center of it. I visited Jaca, the little mountain town where the December revolt broke loose; I talked with all sorts of people, using interpreters of a neutral view or else my own French (which is widely spoken in Spain), at Zaragoza; I spent a week in Madrid during which I saw most of the events of interest and discussed the amazing developments of the time with strategically-

placed informants; and I flew to Barcelona to get in on the Catalonian situation while it was still warm and seething. And from one end to the other, desiring to be as searching as possible and not a gullible swallower of the obvious, I continuously sought to find the flaw in the marvellous spectacle unrolling before my eyes. But I could not put my finger on the flaw, and I cannot do so now.

In all frankness, I do not believe that in a similar crisis the people of the United States could go through what the Spanish people have just gone through, with a discipline one-tenth as fine or a lack of violence one-twentieth as remarkable. Credit should indeed go to Alfonso for his willingness to leave the country when he had to; but far less credit than has been given. He delayed as long as he dared, and he spent a full hour on the final day toying with the suggestion of a militant reactionary in his old Cabinet that machine guns and artillery be turned on the crowds and the anti-monarchist leaders put in prison. He went because he was convinced that all Spain, so far as vocal public opinion was concerned, was against him, and because he was equally convinced that the anti-monarchists possessed a democratic discipline that could not be broken. The process relied on by the revolutionaries was first, the ballot, which the government, though knowing it was dangerous, dared not take away as it did on one previous occasion; and, this failing to dislodge the aristocratic and militaristic handful bent on resisting the people's will, a general strike.

Never were people so eager to assert themselves at the polls; and never so orderly in the face of police preparations of a grimly challenging character. The streets had been sanded for cavalry horses; and the mobs of students and hoodlums who, without sanction by the responsible leaders, baited the police and sought time and again to break through the blue-coated wall that kept them back from the government headquarters, were attacked vigorously by viciously-swung swords, ruthless hoofs, and drawn pistols—and guns which, on the evening before the Republic was proclaimed, felled a number of peaceable demonstrators on one of the wide streets of Madrid. But for five days and nights, unceasingly, thousands of citizens paraded or demonstrated for the Republic, and in all that time there was almost no violence whatever. Two statues were torn down in Madrid; I saw them a moment after when young hooligans were still defacing them with iron bars; but that was all, for the revolutionary leaders saw to it that discipline was maintained. Two hundred and fifty of them slept in the Royal Palace the night the King left, guarding the Queen and the royal properties from possible vandals. Again and again I saw marching crowds sweep up to the square before the Palace, chanting revolutionary tunes and bearing red banners, only to turn back cheerfully when urged to do so by a single policeman wearing a red ribband on his sleeve. And the same organizing ability that got Socialists and Republicans out to the polls and stationed two thousand watchers at the ballot boxes in Madrid alone, with check lists to prevent the old-time vote-buying of the *caciques* or local bosses, also organized, a few days after the revolution, a parade of Socialists a mile and a half long, in which, directly or indirectly, 150,000 persons participated, without a single incident or even so much as a jeer or an act of discourtesy toward the saddened monarchists.

Nor does this moderation mean that radical reforms are not in progress. The land which has been held by a handful of leasers for their workless enrichment, and which has impoverished the masses of farmers and agricultural workers, is to be paid for by the government but nevertheless taken away and opened up for all those who wish to till it for the public good. Education will be completely transformed, the ideal of free inquiry substituted for rigid conformity, and the splendid cultural ideas developed long ago by Spain's great educator, Giner, will be realized as rapidly as possible. The long work day and the opposition of employers to unions in their industries will almost at once become a thing of the past; for while the Socialists and Republicans differ basically on many points, as we shall see when they divide after the establishment of the new *Cortes,* they are agreed that the semi-feudalism which characterized Spanish industry for so long is one of the things that cannot longer be permitted to disgrace Spain in the sight of other countries.

I cannot expect agreement from my readers with every detail of change within the new Spain; but I have to ask them, if I am to tell the truth, to suspend any prejudices they may have, as all of us have, and look at the Iberian peninsula with open eyes. They will see, if they do, that from the trio of anti-monarchist forces have emanated almost all of the cultural and progressive trends in Spain at the present time. Chief of these forces is the Socialist Party of Spain, numbering only fifteen thousand members, but exerting a tremendous influence because it is backed by the two hundred thousand and more trade unionists, and because it contains most of the brains of the country in its ranks. Second, come the intellectuals of political detachment, who may or may not have any definite affiliation, but who ascribe to party a secondary place. Unamuno, Ortega, De Madariaga, and a host of other men of great accomplishment, have lined up behind the anti-monarchist movement. And third come the Republicans, now of indefinite party status, but largely grouped behind Zamora; these are middle-class people, teachers, business men, people of all sorts who are very moderate in Spanish politics, but who would undoubtedly in the United States be looked upon as very far advanced. There is indeed in Spain a Communist movement, but it captured in the municipal elections, out of almost 81,000 seats, only 23.

The marvellous self-control of the revolutionary elements was possible only because, for a long time, there had grown up among the masses of the working people, a feeling of deep solidarity, under the leadership of men who stressed discipline and self-control as vital, in any permanent construction of a new Spanish society. I venture to believe that in no nation in the world, if we count in as belonging to the government the Provisional Cabinet, the under-secretaries, and the foreign representatives already appointed, has so cultured a leadership. The three outstanding Socialists, de los Rios, Caballero, and Prieto, are men who have travelled internationally, who have studied long on Spanish problems, and who represent a type all too rare in governmental circles anywhere. The Republican contingent in the Government, which outnumbers the Socialists, but which supports them in many of the formers' plans, contains President Zamora, a previous Minister; Maura, son of a former Prime Minister;

and a handful of men who remarkably combine experience in university instruction with practical administrative training.

Of course, no millennium has been brought about as yet. Mistakes will be made, perhaps some of them grave. Tremendous problems and difficulties lie ahead. But all the more, then, does Spain deserve our sympathy and aid. It is a land made new, in the sense that age-old barriers to progress have been swept away. The building of a truly new Spain, the establishment of lasting freedom, cannot be accomplished by any revolution of itself, however well-led and constructive. All that must come; but wherever we can, it is for us in the United States, to look ahead with the Spanish people and wish them well upon their brave adventure.

DEVERE ALLEN.

What's Right with the World

or

(The Ayes Have It)

Far be it from me to assume that I can follow G. K. Chesterton and put into definite terms "What's Wrong with the World." It may be that I should not be interested in doing it even if I could. I should find it vastly more satisfying to be able to state what's right with the world. In spite of the awful panorama that unfolds itself daily, and even more nightly, before our eyes, if we live among the crowd, I have an idea that the balance would be in favor of the right.

Did it ever occur to you to ponder over what would remain in the lives of men and women as we know them here and now, if all that is bad and evil and wrong and negative could simply be blotted out, be made non-existent? The idea offers an interesting object for speculation.

Suppose that those that now speak only to utter oaths and obscene language, threats and bullying words, suddenly found themselves unable to express the feelings that had hitherto given rise to such utterances; found even that these very feelings had ceased to move within them, what would be the result? If they were, as sometimes seems to be the case, totally depraved, lower than the brute, they might become, like Lot's wife, a mere pillar of salt that would melt under the first dash of rain and be absorbed into the earth. If, however, they had under their evil appearance still something of beauty, some music that had been silent, some love that had been choked down in childhood, might they not rather be at once transformed into weak, inarticulate suggestions of human beings, looking about pathetically for someone to lean on and to learn from? Perhaps one might better compare such a one to the statue just beginning to emerge from the block of marble under the hand of the artist, and recognizable only by the Master.

In a far more parlous state might be, I fear, the society doll, who had never had a thought above her clothes and her cosmetics save to watch covertly the effect of these clever contrivances on those whose admiration she coveted and to compare them with the remarkably similar coverings and simulations of her kind. One can but hope that the All-Seeing One might find even here at least a shell that might be filled in the course of centuries or aeons with living matter, transmutable into intellect and at last into spirit. The development would needs be slow, for it is easier for the brutish man whose deeds are terrible but strong, to turn those strong deeds to good deeds, than for a self-centered, spineless creature even to lift the workman's tool, to say nothing of striking the anvil.

Is it not undeniable, however, that the world's work is done by neither of the characters I have just cited? The great mass of humanity is certainly carrying on to more or less good purpose, and the work of the world is progressing. If we could find the "average man," does anyone doubt that he is leagues ahead of his brother of a century ago? He has kept plodding along all the time, slipping back often, it is true, but nevertheless making a net advance of at least one foot in three. While he has been keeping the race alive by his labor, he has been gaining in understanding and is on the way to taking his seat in councils of state. What a potency would be uncovered could all his evil thoughts and desires, his envy, his personal ambitions, his coarseness and brutishness fall away as under the magic wand of a celestial fairy! What might he not accomplish for himself and for his fellows, should his better self only remain and find nothing but better selves around to co-operate with him in his labors, more than that, nothing but better selves above him to lead and direct, none but those who had the welfare of the whole at heart, who used their intellects as instruments for good, their wealth as a common fund to aid the less clever, the less strong, the less developed towards that "far off divine event" to which even now "the whole creation moves?"

Suppose there were no longer any one to say: "No, don't do that," because we, as human beings, had nothing in us to do the wrong, the evil act. No more virtues, mind you, than we now possess, only the vices rendered null! If we could only get rid of all the negative commands in the Ten Commandments, how illuminating they would become. Some teachers have put these commandments into positive form. Jesus probably never laid any stress on negative behests. If we could follow, all of us, for one year, any one of his beautiful exhortations, follow it to the letter and in the spirit, the "far off divine event," as far as this earth can grasp it, would have come. What would it matter, if there were some greater souls, if some had clearer vision, if some had higher power, if all the vision and power were used to help on the toilers to the same plane of being? If each one helped everyone about him to climb higher, refused to go until those nearest could go with him, no one can estimate the speed of the advance. How like silly boys and girls in school we have been, like those who fancy that to be lazy without being found out, to waste time and to beguile others into doing the same thing, shows how clever they are.

See the results of this all around us today! There are men and women out of work who have never wasted an opportunity, who have been ready at the call every time. There must be some explanation of their misfortune not apparent on the surface. But does anyone think that the great rank and file of people in the

bread lines have been earnest workers in school? Been always eager to serve, to learn how to serve better, to fit themselves for the place and work for which they were intended? Can anyone who views life seriously and intelligently think that these terrific upheavals are mere accident, and the people afflicted by them innocent victims of a chaotic universe? The problem is not simple. We may see a deep, underlying reason for suffering in a few detached cases, but for the mass the causes are hidden. The most potent causes are always hidden from all but the ones of highest spiritual insight and oftentimes from them. I know of only one method of demonstration. Each one can use it for himself alone. Can we not look back in our own lives upon the sufferings, the blasted hopes, the failures, the thwarted endeavors, and, if far enough removed from the event to view it impersonally, see just why everything had to be as it was? Are we not rejoiced today that we suffered and failed and were cast down? Had we not strayed from the path and so had stood in need of the prick of the goad to bring us back to it? Did we not need to be doing some other work at that time and were we not brought to proper task by failure, even ignominy? Until we learned to turn ignominy into humility, and thus make it divine?

But what of the breadline now, if all the sin and wrong were to disappear? The hoarded millions would come forth to feed and clothe and house the poor chastened souls, and the divine spark in each and everyone would respond to the fanning by the breath of love and we should find ourselves over the top with all humanity at our heels, not striving to outdo one another, but striving to get the very last and weakest mortal past the ditch. What a heavenly train that would be and each face we looked upon would shine as the face of the Savior.

Why can't something be done to bring about such a divine event? Are the obstacles insurmountable? Not to the extent that they are generally regarded as being. One hindrance is the attitude of the average preacher who preaches about sin instead of preaching about godliness. Let them cast aside the negatives. They are like the worm eating the heart of the rose. And how much would remain of many of these preachers, if all save their positive virtues should fall off? How much would remain of some of our bishops and other high prelates? Would not many a coal-begrimed miner shine as the sun beside them?

Isn't it time that we began telling men what to do and how to do it, instead of telling them what not to do? I believe that if every preacher in the world were to preach for one year on the Golden Rule, and Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself, and the positive side of "Even as ye did it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto Me"; were to preach everything implied as well as expressed in these magic sayings; were to make each sermon so different, so intense, so deep-reaching into everyday life as to draw into the church the hitherto indifferent and to arouse the most sluggish minds to pondering over the flaming message, I believe that there would come a change into the thought of the world that would settle the question of breadlines and war, and set all creation on the path that it must eventually follow. DOMBEY SHEPHERD.

Thoughts of Tolstoy

[*Selections from Tolstoy's "Readings for Every Day," here published for the first time in English*]

XCVII

1.

There is no harm done when the body suffers from the soul's work, but it is bad when the most precious thing in man—his soul—suffers from the passions of the body.

2.

What is necessary for the body, just for the body, the body can always get. There must be some particular misfortune for a man to lack the clothing to cover his body, or a piece of bread to fill him. But when the desires of the body are coloured by imagination, there is no end to them, and one can never keep up with them; for there is no end to the desires of imagination.

3.

Happy is that man who consciously and freely exchanges the personal life for the true life of the spirit; but woe to him who holds fast to the personal life. He shall be brought by suffering to renounce it.

4.

If you gratify the body, you weaken it; if you over-work it, you also weaken it. There is one middle way: do not pamper the body and do not exhaust it. But you should remember that in seeking out this middle way, it is more profitable to err in the direction of exhausting the body, than of pampering it. It is more profitable because if you do not satisfy the needs of the body, if you have not eaten enough or slept enough or if you have over-worked, the body will show you your mistake at once. But if it is pampered, it will not show you your mistake at once, but much later, when you have already become weak and unaccustomed to work.

XCVIII

1.

Kind and sensible men are afraid of wealth, while stupid and unkind men spend all their strength on collecting as much as possible of that which sensible men fear.

2.

Wealth, like dung, stinks when it lies in a heap, and is only useful when it is spread out.

3.

It stands to reason that rich men who have made their own fortune, consider this a merit on their part and respect themselves for it. They have sacrificed a great deal for it. But it is astonishing that poor people also respect the rich because they are rich. Why is this? Because the poor as well as the rich, consider wealth a good thing and desire it.

4.

He who has put his strength on gathering riches, will never be satisfied, no matter how much he gathers. The richer a man becomes, the more he needs—and so on without end.

5.

Thieves live by thievery, and robbers by plunder, and neither thieves nor robbers can consider themselves good men until they quit their trade. No prayers or sacrifices can make them good. And just so with rich

and idle men—if they do not work, but make use of the labors of others, they cannot consider themselves good men, or think that their prayers and sacrifices to God can make them so.

6.

We should understand and keep in mind that our life is a lesson that has been set for us. This lesson lies in cultivating our own souls within us.

But how deeply deluded are those men, who instead of cultivating the soul within them, on the contrary, dwarf and pervert it, merely for the sake of collecting as much as possible of that unnecessary and harmful thing—wealth.

7.

Of the two systems of slavery, at one and the same stage of moral development, the system that turns people into private property is without any doubt more humane than the system that turns land into private property. When land is recognized as private property, the people are worn out by toil and hunger, deprived of all the joy and charm of life, doomed to ignorance and a brutish existence, driven to crime and suicide—as if by no one's will, by force of a fatal necessity for which no one is responsible.

After Henry George.

8.

The injustice of holding land as property, like all injustice, is inevitably bound up with a whole series of other injustices and evil deeds which are necessary for its protection.

XCIX

1.

Never trouble another to do what you can do yourself.

2.

A certain rich man had everything that men desire: millions of money, a castle richly decorated, a beautiful wife, hundreds of servants, expensive dinners, all sorts of relishes and wines, and a stable full of the finest horses. And all this bored him so that he would sit in his rich chambers all day long and sigh and complain of boredom. And his only business and joy in life was eating. When he woke up in the morning he could hardly wait for breakfast, after breakfast he could hardly wait for dinner, and after dinner, for supper. But he was soon deprived even of this consolation. He ate such rich food, and so much of it, that his stomach was ruined and he lost his appetite. He called in the doctors, and they gave him medicine and ordered him to walk two hours a day.

And once when he was taking his prescribed two hours walk and thinking all the time of his sorrow, how he had no desire for food, a beggar came up to him.

"For Christ's sake," said he, "give a poor man something."

The rich man was thinking all the while of his own sorrow, of how he was never hungry, so he didn't listen to the beggar.

"Have pity on me, sir, I haven't eaten a thing all day long."

When the rich man heard something about eating, he stopped short.

"What's that? You are hungry?"

"Of course I am, sir. Awfully hungry."

"There's a lucky fellow," thought the rich man, and he envied the poor one.

The poor envy the rich; and the rich, the poor.

It is the same for all. But for the poor it is better, in that the poor are often not to blame for their poverty, while the rich are always to blame for their riches.

3.

If a man living alone exempts himself from the duty of struggling with nature, he is immediately punished by the perishing of his body. But if a man exempts himself from this duty by making other people fulfil it, he is immediately punished by the withering and perishing of his soul.

4.

The highest felicity of life is love. But it is impossible for the rich to love people. How can they love when all their life is founded on struggling with people. All that they possess is made under compulsion, out of the necessity of those who make it, and often with their curses. In order that it should be possible for the rich to love, they must first of all cease to live by the sufferings of others.

5.

Work with the hands, and especially farm work, is beneficial not only to the body, but to the soul. It is hard for people who do not work with their hands to understand things sanely. Such people are incessantly thinking, speaking, listening or reading, so that their minds have no rest and become irritated and confused. Farm work, besides giving rest to the mind, is beneficial in that it brings man nearer to nature.

6.

People think that physical labor interferes with mental, spiritual life. On the contrary, there can only be sound spiritual life when man has not lost the habit of physical labor.

7.

"Division of labor" is mainly an excuse for doing nothing or for doing some sort of trifles, while putting off on others all the necessary labor. Those who administer this division always take to themselves the work that seems most pleasant to them, and offer others that which to them seems hard. And the astonishing thing is that these people always make a mistake, so that the work which seemed pleasant to them turns out in the end to be the very hardest, and that which they avoided the pleasantest.

(*To be continued*)

Caged Eagle

He beats a breast against the bars
That breasted once the sun and stars;

He sulks beneath a metal sky,
Who had the winds to measure by;

With eyes unwinking, cold, that scan
The little staring puppet, man,

Who found him in the heaven-ways,
And circumscribed his aerie days;

Who calls him, dreaming men are free,
The symbol of his liberty.

EDITH MIRICK

Women and War

Following the truest in their nature, women are against war. Respect for human life with them is innate. No woman who is a real woman says of a human body, "It is nothing" (Olive Schreiner). We may leave the professional psychologists to explain the mass-psychosis from the beginning of the last war, subjugating also the women who, with familiar patriotic fervor not only dismissed their husbands, their fiancés, their sons to the battlefield but in many cases actually forced them to go. May the Freudian experts explain the insensate female admiration for the hero, for the splendor of the military coat, the whole degeneration of sentiment in a time of general folly. We only want to state simply what women did during the war. I hope they will themselves—at least the thinking ones—draw the inevitable conclusions.

Most of the married women saw themselves, after the departure of their husbands, under obligation to work in order to sustain their families. This conceded, we can in all fairness and justice measure the importance of their work. They were encouraged by the highest examples. In Austria as well as in Germany the War Ministries appealed urgently to the women to take the places of the departed men or to render possible the sending of these men to the front. In July, 1917, the number of German women thus aiding immediately the military powers was 64,142 (double the number of boys and old men replacing those fit for military service). The commissions of "War-Help" were ordered not to give any succor in cases where the woman was childless or only had a small family, or where the grandmother was able to take care of the children. This to force the women to go to work! Everywhere recruiting offices were installed, where women were promised wonders if they would agree to go to work in ammunition factories. Above all in Germany the idea of "Duty to the Fatherland" was forced upon them. The War Ministry worked with a methodical, precise and efficacious organization. A lot of great writers of both sexes was employed to incite the women by passionate appeals and to "interest them in the ammunition work." Press, movies, everything was as we know, at the service of the military powers. The university rectors addressed themselves to the consciences of the women-students, the clergy to the believing masses. In August, 1918, the *Kriegsamt Kassel* "succeeded" in recruiting in a fortnight more than 2,000 women for an ammunition factory. Special schools and courses were opened in order to initiate the women to the manufacture of arms.

Women were busy during the war in all kinds of professions. Even those which up to that time had been—and for good reasons—closed to them! They were not only postmen, conductors of electric cars and taxis, controllers of gas and electricity, employees in the military offices, nurses—but also employees of railway (25,000 in Austria at the end of the war), miners and especially ammunition workers. The culminating point of women-work was attained in Germany in August, 1917, when the "Hindenburg Program" was realized.

Statistics on a large scale hardly exist. But one can deduce conclusions from the registers of the Sick-Funds. In 1913, in Austria, 58,296 women were registered at the *"Allegemeine Arbeiter krankenkasse."* In 1915 their number amounted to 71,133, an increase of 22.2%. We find in 1914 39,079 women registered at the *"Hiener Bezirks krankenkasse."* By the end of 1915 there were 51,939, an increase of 32.88%.

According to the researches of the *"Deutscher Metallarbeiterverband"* (September, 1916) in the Rhineland and Westphalia alone 67,548 women worked in the metalline industry. In all Germany in 1914 there were 12,968 women occupied in that industry; in 1917 their number was 624,688. At Krupp's one counts in 1915, 1,342 women. In 1916 there are 12,600.

These few figures will perhaps suffice to give an idea of the gigantic effort made by women during the war.

The women adapted themselves, so it seems, extremely well to the manufacture of all sorts of projectiles. They surpassed the men because of their innate ability, their perseverance and precision in all manual activity. They made wonderful shells and Krupp publicly declared himself satisfied with their work.

In peace-time the work of women was (and still is) more poorly paid than work done by men. One can understand how in war-time, under stress of circumstances, the women contented themselves with ridiculously small salaries. In Austria the wage for women at the start was 8 crowns per week, 14 crowns for men. The city of Vienna paid the male train conductor for his daily work 3 crowns 90 heller, the woman-conductor (if she worked 10 hours) 3 crowns 60 heller (36 heller per hour). In the ammunition factories of lower Austria, there were women with a weekly salary of 30 to 50 crowns. During the second year of war, in working hard for 14 to 16 hours the day, they realized a weekly salary of 80 to 90 crowns. In the imperial ammunition factory at Hoellersdorf, the women never had more than 23 to 29 crowns a week for working 12 hours a day. In the Bohemian mines, we find daily wages from 2 crowns 50 heller to 2 crowns 80 heller.

In Germany the women generally received in the metalline industry 35 pfennigs the hour. Following the *"Statistik des Deutschen Reiches"* (vol. 293, page 18) their daily salary in the most important industries varied between 1 mark 49 pfennigs and 2 marks 37 pfennigs.

The women not only satisfied themselves with low salaries. They did better. Their well-known assiduity, the wish to earn for the moment as much as possible—at their health's cost—induced them to do supplementary hours. And so they helped quite innocently and very effectively to prolong the war. It happened several times in Austria that men already freed from military service were again sent to the trenches, because the women worked more than they and their exemption was no more necessary. It happened that married women, mothers, begged to be allowed to stay at work for 14 hours daily. It happened—frequently—that women, on night-duty during a whole week, only slept for 3 hours. In the mines of Upper-Silesia they worked—alternate duty of 12 hours—in suffocating heat or glacial damp.

The work during the war ruined, killed thousands of women. First, it is to be remembered that women took up work, to which they were not in the least ac-

customed, already enfeebled by domestic worries and child-bearing. Already badly nourished in peace-time, they cruelly suffered from hunger during the war. And —last but not least—they saw themselves—especially in the ammunition factories and in the industry of explosives—surrounded by serious danger and menaced by all kinds of diseases resulting from their profession.

The German registers tell us that the number of women receiving indemnities in case of accidents was steadily augmented from 1914 to 1918. In one mine there were 48 in 1914, 469 in 1918. In the metalline industry 454 in 1914, 3,619 in 1918. Mortal cases: in 1914—4.3 (counted pro thousand). In 1918 —8.4 (counted pro thousand). And so forth.

The women working at the manufacture of shrapnel suffered—due to the effort necessary for the lifting of heavy pieces—from abdominal maladies, muscle-contortions, distensions of the liver. In the industry of explosives, handling gas and corrosive liquids, they got diseases of the skin, of the respiratory organs. Soap and disinfectants failing, these diseases became aggravated and often ended by death. The women poisoned themselves with arsenic, phosphorus, mercury and all chemical combinations of lead. More than with men the "blood-poisons," the chemical combinations of nitrate basis ruined their bodies.

The psychical ravages are too well known to need to be stressed. One fact: in Austria, in the ammunition factory of Woellersdorf, young boys and girls slept together in the barracks. A curtain separated them. The girls—three or four—the healthy ones and those suffering from sexual diseases, slept on the same straw-mat. Hundreds of young Austrian girls were ruined physically and psychically in the ammunition factories.

Humanity forgets quickly. Four years of war, twelve years of armed peace, of revolutions, of inexpressible misery throughout the world, and we are ready for—or at least resigned to—new deeds. The bloody strife—perfected by late scientific inventions—can begin anew. The men will go to the front, the women will take their places in the hinterland. The danger resulting from the professions will be augmented for them, for their children, by the constant menace of bombs sweeping countries and cities.

The women who in the last war lost their husbands, their sons, who ruined themselves, will be replaced by others, younger ones, thousands of others.

Women, what are you going to do, if a new war breaks out?

(Dr.) Anna Nussbaum.

The Study Table

A Program of Social Reform

In this remarkable book* Norman Thomas emerges as not only a clever campaigner, a relentless political adversary, keen thinker and hard-hitter, but a far-seeing, broad-minded patriotic statesman, with a thoroughness of study of economic and political problems exceedingly rare among men in public life today. The key to the scheme followed in his book is given in the preface.

> I had found myself possessed of two ideas which to my mind are logically consistent but which do not always keep house together easily and are often misinterpreted as if they were in essential conflict. The one is the necessity of a philosophy adequate to our times, the other the necessity of a program in line with that philosophy and also in line with immediate needs.

The book is the developing of these two ideas. The "philosophy" is far from an *a priori* one. It is developed out of a keen observation and evaluation of "the World Machinery Gives Us." From a statistical study of the present day distribution of wealth with its devastatingly low wages, and its disproportionately high monetary rewards to owners, managers and favored stockholders, Mr. Thomas opens one's eyes to the "pervading sense of insecurity" among vast numbers of workers. "Most of us are under the dominion of fear." The author is impressed not so much with "the inexcusable poverty of countryside and city, not the unnecessary ugliness of a land richly blessed by nature, but (with) this all-pervading fear."

After several chapters highly illuminating in the keenness of their analysis of existing conditions under Capitalism new as well as old, of Communism, and (according to our author) its correlate, War, as ways of salvation, Mr. Thomas takes up his philosophy, preparatory to the discussion of a program. By philosophy he means not a philosophy that is "cold and abstract," nor a religion that suggests an other worldly interest and theology. It is rather "a social ideal, a great organizing loyalty." After a discriminating appreciation and critique of the Marxian and Hegelian formulas, Mr. Thomas declares that "the corner stone of that philosophy is the absolute necessity of planned control of the resources and machinery of the world in the common interest if we are to avoid disaster, to say nothing of achieving plenty, peace and freedom," the three basic essentials of the goal of his program. And somewhat later, after having spoken of the "consumers" as a class, he says:

> Finally a general appeal to consumers which loses the direct force of the contrast between workers and owners, which ignores specific reference to the social parasitism of the owning class, and which does not mention the ethical shame of living without working in a world where there is no wealth, no food, no shelter, no life, without work is emotionally weak and one sided.

Again,

> It is a philosophy of ultimate plenty for all, but it is not a philosophy of easy transition without toil. Its highest appeal is to nothing less than human solidarity. . . . Socialism is not a fixed and rigid scheme even of economic relations. It wants to destroy only so much of the old as endangers peace and freedom and plenty and to establish no more restraints than the working of specialized machinery for the common good makes necessary.

The chapter on A Socialist Philosophy closes on this clear note:

> In a world ever threatened by war not even the most fortunate of us are safe, and in a world of gross and ruthless inequality and oppression no individual can be truly free. . . . To say this is to preach not Utopian but realistic socialism.

The remaining chapters of this remarkable book deal with the "program" that shall bring to all classes of society, "plenty, peace and freedom." "The first and most important problem of socialism is the actual shift of property, and with it power over those things

---

*America's Way Out, A Program for Democracy, by Norman Thomas. Published by the Macmillan Company. $2.50.

necessary for the common life from private ownership and management for profit to social control for use." "To begin with socialists seek first the 'key industries' or the 'commanding heights' of our economic system." The author quotes with approval John A. Hobson when he urged "beginning with those industries and services in which already the engineer is more important than the *entrepreneur*."

Single taxers will be pleased that in discussing "Other Economic Problems" Mr. Thomas argues for a tax on the rental values of land with the conviction of a follower of Henry George, without however assuming that such a tax is all that is necessary for the solution of America's social and industrial problems.

> It will end the injustice of taxing a man for improving his lot with a home while his neighbor who holds the land for speculation and raises only weeds pays a low tax until the work of the home owners or some public improvement enables him to sell at a profit. . . . To sum up this matter of taxation. The main dependence of socialism in a transition period will be a tax taking over the rental value of land, and heavy, graduated taxes on incomes and inheritances.

Socialization of money, banking and credit is taken up after taxation, and discussed in the same thorough way.

One feels impelled to quote at length from the chapter on Socialism and the Individual. A few sentences must suffice:

> Not masses but men hunger and thirst, love and hate, fear and hope. . . . The first thing that socialism will do for the individual is to strike from him the chains of poverty and economic insecurity. . . . No one can estimate what man may achieve in the arts and sciences until he has been delivered from the fear of tomorrow's hunger. Only planned production for use and not for profit can end the monstrous folly under which men are told that they starve because they have produced too much food, go naked because they made too much cloth, and live in shanties because they have turned out too much building material.

Mr. Thomas argues for "social (unemployment) insurance, a national labor code and family allowances" under the social administration. But all of these must be so administered as not to transfer the fear of the workingman from his private employer to the state as a conscripter of his labor. Mr. Thomas has these wise words to say about Prohibition:

> In general law should touch as little as possible, and only on the clearest possible evidence of social necessity, the personal habits and pleasures of men. It is on these points rather than on the score of individual liberty that the prohibition experiment has broken down. At the same time there is nothing particularly noble or consistent about men who talk as if they were running slaves to freedom on the old underground railroad or defying the immense might of the state in the name of conscience like the war objectors because they in perfect safety patronize bootleggers who take whatever risks there are and in taking them create the conditions under which criminal racketeering waxes brazen and prosperous.

A word in season, yet one misses here the outline of successive next steps in the social control of the liquor traffic that is so impressive in the discussion of other phases of the social transition to socialism. It is true, Mr. Thomas says later, that prohibition should be submitted to popular referendum. One is bound to ask, How can this be done? What machinery is there in our election methods for casting a vote for any particular question? All our election arrangements are in the hands of the states. Suppose any state should not care to go to the trouble or the expense of arranging for a vote on prohibition? What then? Mr. Borah and others have suggested that every war should be voted on by national referendum. Even the electors for president are state officials. No one votes directly for president. The direct vote for United States senators had to be preceded by a constitutional amendment. Shall we add another amendment to the constitution to find out if it be wise to repeal another? So much for prohibition. Other changes which socialism should bring about and are considered in the chapters on Political Theory and Structure, and Socialism and Internationalism are not so very different from what liberals have suggested without particular regard to socialism. So, too, the altogether fine discussion of trades unions and cooperatives, and of the excellent philosophical chapter which concludes the book, Can We Make a Better World? Here surely we see the man, more or less detached from political entanglements, facing the world with restrained optimism, with high idealism and a philosophy broad enough to look at life cosmically yet humanly. In the Epilogue, after ruling out the New Capitalism and Communism as two possibilities of the way out, Mr. Thomas says:

> The only thing left is the possibility of achieving socialism by democratic processes and without world war. It is a possibility, not a certainty. It must be worked out. To work it out is the greatest task farseeing men have ever undertaken for society. It is a task which requires not a dogmatic creed but a living philosophy of cooperation in owning and managing the things necessary for our common life, a philosophy of the dignity of work and the shame of shirking, a philosophy made beautiful by the hope of plenty, peace and freedom in an interdependent world.

It will be strange indeed if this book does not go far toward dispelling the "bogey" of socialism. Much more than this it will be accepted, we believe, at once, as the most searching and the fairest criticism of the politico-capitalistic social structure of our present order, with at the same time a high-minded philosophy and program for "America's Way Out."

JAMES A. FAIRLEY.

The Field

(*Continued from Page* 226)

will require legal interpretation. Our biggest point is Art. 9, Sec. 9, of the Constitution of California as amended on November 5th, 1918, which reads in part as follows: "The University of California shall constitute a public trust to be administered by the existing corporation known as "The Regents of the University of California," with full powers of organization and government subject only to such legislative control as may be necessary to insure compliance with the terms of the endowments of the University and the security of its funds."

Since the United States Government, through an interpretation by Attorney-General Mitchell last June, has indicated that land-grant colleges having optional military drill will not be violating the terms of their endowment under the Morrell Land Grant Act of 1862, certainly the legislature would have no power to compel the Regents to keep compulsory drill at the University.

Therefore, we are taking a stand against the compulsory feature of military drill in the University of California in all its branches and we feel that if enough public opinion is aroused on this issue we will succeed.

Edward Walther,
Student Leader in this Movement.

Petition

To the Regents of the
University of California:

We, the undersigned students of the University of California at Los Angeles, most respectfully present this, our petition. We ask that all military training at this institution be changed from a compulsory to a voluntary basis, and give the following reasons why this move can and should be made:

1. Although this is a land-grant col-

lege, none of the provisions of the United States government relating to the land-grant colleges requires compulsory military training. This has been accepted by the government for a good many years. The University of Cincinnati and the University of Wisconsin have made their military courses elective without loss of government aid.

2. The National Defense Act of 1920, which provides schools offering military training government support which is additional to that given under the Land-Grant Act, specifically states that these courses may be elective.

3. The War Department has officially stated that, so far as it is concerned, it is up to the school authorities whether military training shall be an elective or compulsory course in the curriculum. (Secretary Weeks, Nov. 18, 1924).

4. In the military training act of March 4, 1870, the legislature of California permits the Regents of the University of California to make regulations concerning military training requirements. (Section 5).

5. Many students object to military training for religious and other reasons.

6. Compulsory drill does not coincide with the accepted peace policy of this nation as set forth in the Kellogg Peace Pact.

7. Public sentiment, as expressed by members of religious bodies and other progressive organizations, is overwhelmingly in favor of voluntary drill.

Therefore, there are many of us who desire to see military training become an elective course, and since it would be possible to make it elective with relatively little loss to anyone and with little effort, we respectfully request that you give this petition favorable consideration.

The Loin-Cloth

A critic has fallen foul of my remark made before the meeting of the Federation of Chambers of Commerce at Delhi that the Indian civilization must not be allowed to be wiped out by the inroads from the West. The critic has confused Indian civilization with the loin-cloth and then condemned it.

Mr. Churchill has been kind enough gratuitously to advertise my loin-cloth to the whole world. It has therefore become the fashion to laugh at it as the said critic has done. Let me then explain what it means.

In 1921 Maulana Mahomed Ali was arrested at Waltair whilst he and I were going on a tour to the South. He was torn from Begum Mahomed Ali who was travelling with us. I was deeply moved. She bore the separation bravely and attended meetings in Madras. I left her at Madras and went as far as Madura. On the way I saw in our compartment crowds that were wholly unconcerned with what had happened. Almost without exception they were bedecked in foreign fineries. I entered into conversation with some of them and pleaded for Khadi. For I had no other way open to me to secure the release of the Ali Brothers save through Khadi. They shook their heads as they said, "We are too poor to buy Khadi and it is so dear." I realized the substratum of truth behind the remark. I had my vest, cap, and full dhoti on. When these uttered only partial truth, the millions of compulsorily naked men, save for their langoti four inches wide and nearly as many feet long, gave through their bare limbs the naked truth. What effective answer could I give them, if it was not to divest myself of every inch of clothing I decently could and thus to a still greater extent bring myself in a line with the ill-clad masses? And this I did the very next morning after the Madura meeting.

Here then there is no question of loin-cloth civilization. The adoption of the loin-cloth was for me a sheer necessity. But in so far as the loin-cloth also spells simplicity let it represent Indian civilization. It is a mingling of the cultures represented by the different faiths and influenced by the geographic and other environment in which the cultures have met. Thus Islamic culture is not the same in Arabia, Turkey, Egypt and India but it is itself influenced by the conditions of the respective countries, Indian culture is therefore Indian. It is neither Hindu, Islamic nor any other, wholly. It is a fusion of all and essentially Eastern. I had in mind that culture. And every one who calls himself or herself an Indian is bound to treasure that culture, be its trustee and resist any attack upon it.

European civilization is no doubt suited for the Europeans but it will mean ruin for India, if we endeavor to copy it. This is not to say that we may not adopt and assimilate whatever may be good and capable of assimilation by us as it does not also mean that even the Europeans will not have to part with whatever evil might have crept into it. The incessant search for material comforts and their multiplication is such an evil, and I make bold to say that the Europeans themselves will have to remodel their outlook, if they are not to perish under the weight of the comforts to which they are becoming slaves. It may be that my reading is wrong, but I know that for India to run after the Golden Fleece is to court certain death. Let us engrave on our hearts the motto of a Western philosopher "Plain living and high thinking." Today it is certain that the millions cannot have high living and we the few who profess to do the thinking for the masses run the risk, in a vain search after high living, of missing high thinking.

—*M. K. Gandhi.*

Young India

Military Insurance!

"The last war cost the United States $51,000,000,000, counting interest to date, according to Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury.

"As recently as 1885, $51,000,000,000 would have bought the whole United States, with everybody and everything in it, lock, stock and barrel.

"Today $51,000,000,000 would buy sixteen states like Alabama, or three enormously rich Californias, with a couple of Colorados thrown in for good measure.

"It would buy the entire state of New York—including the metropolis, wonder city of the world—and there would still be left over enough change to acquire four states like Maryland.

"If you had started throwing away dollars the day Christ was born, and had kept it up ever since at the rate of a dollar a minute without pausing either to eat or to sleep, you would only now be starting on your second billion, with 95,000 years more to go.

"At 5 per cent, fifty-one billion dollars would provide an annual income of $2,550,000,000, or enough to pension 2,125,000 old and broken-down workers at $100 a month, virtually abolishing poverty in this country.

"That is what the World War has cost you to date, and the end is not yet. Former President Coolidge estimates the total cost will be more than 100 billion dollars, or about the present value of all the states west of the Mississippi. The ransom of an empire burned up in battle."—Wm. Philip Simms, *New York Telegram*, Feb. 14, 1931, quoted in the *World Tomorrow* (May, 1931).

"To Smoke or Not to Smoke"

By Marie H. Hotchener

A pamphlet giving opinions of expert physicians on the subject.

Send large stamped envelope and 6c postage for a sample copy of pamphlet to

Miss Esther Pringle
No. 6 Arlington St., Rochester, N. Y.

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE AT JOHNSON'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876